

NOTICE: THIS DECISION DOES NOT CREATE LEGAL PRECEDENT AND  
MAY NOT BE CITED EXCEPT AS AUTHORIZED BY APPLICABLE RULES.  
See Ariz. R. Supreme Court 111(c); ARCAP 28(c); Ariz. R. Crim. P. 31.24

FILED BY CLERK

SEP 14 2010

COURT OF APPEALS  
DIVISION TWO

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS  
STATE OF ARIZONA  
DIVISION TWO

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,	)	2 CA-CR 2010-0014
	)	DEPARTMENT A
Appellee,	)	
	)	<u>MEMORANDUM DECISION</u>
v.	)	Not for Publication
	)	Rule 111, Rules of
STEPHANIE DAWN RAMIREZ,	)	the Supreme Court
	)	
Appellant.	)	
_____	)	

APPEAL FROM THE SUPERIOR COURT OF PIMA COUNTY

Cause No. CR20084971

Honorable Howard Fell, Judge Pro Tempore

AFFIRMED

West, Christoffel & Zickerman, PLLC  
By Anne Elsberry

Tucson  
Attorneys for Appellant

H O W A R D, Chief Judge.

¶1 Appellant Stephanie Ramirez was convicted after a jury trial of transporting more than two pounds of marijuana for sale. The trial court sentenced her to a mitigated term of three years' imprisonment.

¶2 Counsel has filed a brief in compliance with *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), avowing she has reviewed the entire record and found no arguable issue to raise on appeal. In compliance with *State v. Clark*, 196 Ariz. 530, ¶ 32, 2 P.3d 89, 97

(App. 1999), counsel has also provided “a detailed factual and procedural history of the case with citations to the record, [so ]this court can satisfy itself that counsel has in fact thoroughly reviewed the record.” *Id.* We have reviewed the record in its entirety and are satisfied it supports counsel’s recitation of the facts. Ramirez has not filed a supplemental brief.

¶3 Viewed in the light most favorable to upholding the jury’s verdicts, *see State v. Tamplin*, 195 Ariz. 246, ¶ 2, 986 P.2d 914, 914 (App. 1999), the evidence, along with reasonable inferences from the evidence, established Ramirez had been riding in an “escort vehicle” for a van that contained 324 pounds of marijuana when she attempted to help the van’s driver evade pursuing law enforcement officers.

¶4 We conclude substantial evidence supported findings of all the elements necessary for Ramirez’s convictions, and her sentences are within the authorized range. *See* A.R.S. §§ 13-702(D), 13-3405(A)(4), (B)(11). In our examination of the record pursuant to *Anders*, we have found no reversible error and no arguable issue warranting further appellate review. *See Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744. Accordingly, we affirm Ramirez’s convictions and sentences.

/s/ Joseph W. Howard

JOSEPH W. HOWARD, Chief Judge

CONCURRING:

/s/ J. William Brammer, Jr.

J. WILLIAM BRAMMER, JR., Presiding Judge

/s/ Philip G. Espinosa

PHILIP G. ESPINOSA, Judge